Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 20 Jan 93   Volume 93 : Issue   17

Today's Topics:
                              (none)
                        430mhz band under th
                 Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)
               Exam Dates for the Novice Class in CAMBRIDGE
    FCC Awards Pioneers Preference to Volunteers in Tech Assistance
Further evidence that CW should no be longer relevant was (Re: USCG cw changes)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1993 20:49:17 GMT
From: psinntp!cmhcsys.com!chuck@uunet.uu.net
Subject: (none)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9301171501.aa13650@ingate.microsoft.COM>, a-kevinp@microsoft.COM
(Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:
> Quent Johnson (quent@md.fsl.noaa.gov) said:
>
>> What if someone sends email containing obscenities.
>> What about sound files containing music?
>> What about email to mailing lists -- is this considered broadcasting?
>
> I say:
>
> I'm sure the control op eithe inspects the mail (unlikely) or has a
> kill file that looks for "obsscene, indecent, or profane words" in the

> text and doesn't allow transmission if it finds one. The full part of
> 97.113(d) goes futher than this though: obsscene, indecent, or profane
> words or meaning [it might be difficult to stop the later with a kill
> file is only 'clean' words are used]; and/or false or deceptive
> messages or signals [this too are more difficult to detect]". Once must
> also be wary of commerical messages (i.e look for the string "900" :-).
>
<more interesting stuff deleted>

> 72/73 Kevin, N7WIM / G8UDP
> a-kevinp@microsoft.com
>

Howdy!

    My question is: Why can't the sys-op (or whomever) setup a
"filter" that does a Rot13 on the "obscene, indecent, or profane words"?
Does this count as "Encryption", making _it_ illegal?

Chuck
was once WD8JPR
chuck@cmhcsys.com

Date: Mon, 18 Jan 93 08:51:24 EST
From: gatech!wa4mei!nanovx!gloster!cutter@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 430mhz band under th
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

> In article <1993Jan3.053500.18260@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Go
> >In article <uJZTwB1w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca> emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca writes:
> >>The impression I got from the previous poster was that he felt it was his
> >>right to operate anywhere in the band he felt like, and whether or not it
> >>brought up a repeater - as long as he couldn't hear anyone else on the
> >>channel.
> >   ...   I feel like it is the previous
> >poster's right to operate _*INTENTIONALLY*_ on a repeater's input frequency
> >_PROVIDED_IT_IS_NOT_CAUSING_INTERFERENCE_TO_ANOTHER_QSO_. While I may only
> >be a No-Code, I can read English. All the regulations I have read and seen
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> Geeze.....I thought we were discussing this with someone who has long
> and distinguished experience with frequency coordination and FM repeaters!

Finally, we can see what it's all about.

"I was here first. They are my toys and you can't play with them."

Alright both you children go to your rooms and don't come back down until
you can play together nicely!


```
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
cutter@gloster.via.mind.org (chris)     All jobs are easy
                                        to the person who
                                        doesn't have to do them.
                                                    Holt's law
```

Date: Tue, 19 Jan 93 22:34:19 GMT
From: btree!bly@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

FCC insiders say closed repeater's days are numbered.

I have acquaintances in the FCC (DC Legal Staff) that tell me there
are several in the agency at the central and field levels that want
closed repeaters to be disallowed on the ham bands.
They said they have been getting increasing complaints about
the number of closed repeaters (2m, 440) in larger cities.
They also feel that many frequency coordinators are not doing a
good job of managing the ratio of open to closed repeaters.

If codified, the new rule would give open repeaters priority over
closed repeaters on the same pair. Closed repeater would be given
the opportunity to "open", otherwise their pair would be reallocated
effectively shutting them down in the event of an interference
dispute. I would rather have closed repeaters outlawed all together,
but I think this is a fair solution because it allows closed
repeaters in rural areas where they are not a problem and
effectively disallows them in larger cities where they are becoming
a big problem.

Some buddies and I have been fighting the battle against closed, money-
gathering repeaters since the late 1970s. We have used litigation and
"jamming" as means to persuade closed repeaters to open or release their
pair. Here is some of what I have learned over the years via several
FCC warnings , show cause orders, phone calls, letters, etc.
A lot of this is commen sense, but here goes:

(Source: Long Beach, CA FCC Field Office)
OK to use the input of a repeater as simplex channel.

Must listen to repeater input to make sure not in use before TXing.

(San Diego, CA Field Office)
Same as above, but assumes you knew or should have known that
your were using a repeater input frequency for simplex operation.
Thus, good amateur practice dictates that you also must listen
on the repeater output before transmitting.

(Long Beach Field)
Simplex operation on a repeater output is OK. Repeater users are
causing interference if they knowingly key repeater while you are
operating on output.

(Long Beach Field - Per Larry Guy, Engineer in Charge "off the record")
Don't expect FCC to get involved in simplex vs. repeaters.
Too hard to determine who was hearing who on input vs. output.
Several complaints may generate a warning letter.

(San Diego, CA Field Office 1982)
Playing a taped "QST" on a repeater input is OK if the input is clear,
and the intent is not to interfere with normal repeater operation.
Playing a 30min QST on a clear repeater 5min before a scheduled net
on that repeater is malicious interference because the intent is to
interfere with regularly scheduled public service operations.
(FCC Central disagreed 1984)

(Livermore, CA Field)
It is OK to make comments/remarks during a net or roundtable operation
as long as the identification and malicious interference requirements
are met. A net control or group with communication is progress can
prevent "unauthorized" users from transmitting.

(FCC central 1985)
No FCC rule/reg prevents one from operating on a "closed" repeater
with out the permission of the owners/operators.

(FCC central 1991)
OK to put an uncoordinated repeater on a freq. pair in use by a closed
repeater as long a reasonable care is taken to prevent interference.
In the event of interference between repeaters, Both parties have
the burden to reduce interference, but you will have more or the burden.
The FCC will give plenty of time for the parties to resolve conflict before
taking action. IF THE COORDINATED REPEATER REFUSES COOPERATE TO REDUCE
THE INTERFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO SYSTEMS, THAT REPEATER TRUSTEE WILL BE
FOUND AT FAULT EVEN THOUGH HIS/HER REPEATER IS THE COORDINATED ONE.

I have long thought that closed repeater were wrong for several reasons,

but now it appears that they are on the way out because they do not make
sense on amateur bands, they do not use bandwidth efficiently, there are
now much better ways allocate private communication channels.

Roger (ka6mwt)

Date: 19 Jan 93 23:49:31 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
hri.com!noc.near.net!news.cs.brandeis.edu!chaos.cs.brandeis.edu!
slanka@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Exam Dates for the Novice Class in CAMBRIDGE
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello Netters!

If anyone has the exam dates for the novice class test in
the Boston/Cambridge area could you please email it to me.
I have looked around the net for this information but it
does not seem be available. Many thanks-

Ishantha Lokuge
email: slanka@chaos.cs.brandeis.edu

Date: 19 Jan 93 00:43:00 GMT
From: cs.ubc.ca!unixg.ubc.ca!kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!ersys!ve6mgs!rec-radio-
info@beaver.cs.washington.edu
Subject: FCC Awards Pioneers Preference to Volunteers in Tech Assistance
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Here is a press release from Volunteers in Technical Assistance.

FCC Awards Pioneers Preference to Volunteers in Technical Assistance
To: National Desk, Science Writer
Contact: Joe Sedlak of Volunteers in Technical Assistance,
         703-276-1800

   WASHINGTON, Jan. 14 -- The Federal Communications Commission today
allocated four MHz of VHF/UHF spectrum to the Mobile Satellite Service
for the low-earth orbit satellites (LEO-MSS) and finalized the
tentative pioneer's preference awarded to Volunteers in Technical
Assistance (VITA).

   The award is the first pioneer preference granted by the
commission.

Henry Norman, president of VITA, said "We are deeply gratified by
the action taken by the FCC. VITA's global communications network is
designed to bring scientific and technical knowledge to the poor in
developing countries. The Pioneer's Preference given to VITA for
advancing the technology and extending communications to people not
now served indicates a recognition that the poor of the world should
not be denied a share in benefits of modern technology.

   The FCC stated that it awarded the pioneer's preference to VITA
because it was the first to develop and demonstrate the utility of a
small low earth orbiting satellite system for civilian communications
purposes. The commission also noted that VITA's pioneering efforts
led to this proceeding authorizing spectrum for LEOs to provide
services that will provide low-cost data communications between ground
stations located anywhere in the world.

   VITA's system, VITASAT, is designed to provide data communications
between 1,000 ground stations, most of them located in developing
countries. A major use of the global network will be for disaster
prevention, preparedness and mitigation communications.

   Norman said, "Our goal is to help bring the poor people of the
developing world into the information mainstream of development. VITA
is really about inclusion -- extending the benefits of modern science
and technology to the poor."

   VITA has already installed ground stations connected to the VITASAT
prototype, the PACSAT Communications Experiment, in Sierra Leone,
Djibouti, Indonesia, Pakistan, Ireland, the South Pole, and at the
Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico.

   "Today's FCC decision is very important to the development of the
VITASAT program," said Helena Wisniewski, VITA's vice president of
communications technology. "The FCC's granting the Pioneer's
Preference has been the catalyst for the development of the next
generation of fully-automated ground stations which will be less
expensive and easier to use than our prototypes in the field today."

   VITASAT is one part of a system called VITACOMM that also includes
terrestrial digital packet radio networks in several countries
(VITAPAC), and an electronic E-Mail system (VITANET). VITACOMM is
designed to link people with the rest of the world.

Nigel Allen, Toronto, Ontario   ndallen@r-node.pci.on.ca
--

Date: 19 Jan 1993 22:34:41 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!ncar!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!sgiblab!cs.uoregon.edu!news.uoregon.edu!fp2-
st-affairs-3.uoregon.edu!user@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Further evidence that CW should no be longer relevant was (Re: USCG cw
changes)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <930116.121247.9h2.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,
rick@ricksys.lonestar.org (Richard McCombs KB5SNF) wrote:

> As I practice CW I find it's not so hard but, unless I fall in love
> with it I probably won't ever use it. If it takes me 30 minutes a day,
> at least 5 days a week, for 4 weeks or more to get from 5 wpm to 13
> could not this time be used for something better (not that wouldn't
> waste the time)?
>
> I'll listen to and (or) read any argument except, "You have to do it
> because I had to," or "What if your in a plane that crashes and the
> mike is broke and you can only communicate by touching two wires
> together."

I'm not trying to flame you but I just want to stick up for a mode that I
enjoy immensely.

One of my passions is working DX. With lower power and crowded band
conditions, SSB is sometimes very difficult. CW has been THE WAY to get
through. I don't have to rely on a machine to do it, I rely on my own skill
and get a real sense of pleasure and accomplishment.

Oh, and regarding your statement that you don't want to hear the argument
that you have to do it because I had to... the argument I hear from this
statement is that amateurs shouldn't have to do it because you can't.

Have fun with the code! Hi!
Steve/AA7FL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #17
****